[Goodell, Abner Cheney.]

E S S A Y

on

ANCIENT ARCHITECTURE IN NEW ENGLAND,

to be read before the

OLD PLANTERS' SOCIETY,

in Boston,

Wednesday, March 23, 1904.

No person of culture, but a bastard or a hereditary reprobate, can fail to be interested in his ancestry. Indolence, mental incapacity or the want of imagination is the only excuse for indifference to the history of his forbears, and at least some yearning for a knowledge of their experiences in the part they played in the drama of life. The Old Planters' Society, formed to commemorate the pioneer immigrant planters of New England- to throw light upon their personal careers and on the obscure incidents of their political and ecclesiastical organization, which constituted the cradle of our Commonwealth- need not apologize for its being. With whatever emotions others may regard the short and simple annals of those brave Englishmen who, nearly three centuries ago, encountered great perils and hardships for a high purpose, we, their descendants, can neither repress nor conceal our pride at their success and our admiration of their fortitude and self-sacrifice. These sentiments, together with a high appreciation of the superior moral worth of these, our ancient kindred and neigh-

bors, are with us irresistible incentives to become possessed of the minutest details of their history.

Though much has been done to lift the veil which for generations enshrouded those pioneers of the Massachusetts Colony, many doubts remain to be dispelled, which past experience encourages us to believe is not beyond all possibility. The purpose of my essay today is in this direction: I shall endeavor to make some progress toward filling a hiatus in the record of secular and religious life in the plantation between the date of the arrival of Governor Endicott and the summer of 1635, when, for the first time, the town records show that a meeting-house had been erected in Salem.

The question as to whether or not the frame of a certain structure which the Committee of the Essex Institute last appointed to settle the question very aptly describe as "a small dilapidated out-building put to very homely uses," on premises remote from the centre of the city, is veritably the frame of the meeting-house I have just mentioned- that is, of the first house erected for public worship in Salem- has recently been settled by the adverse report of

lore, are with us irresistible incentives to become possessed of the minutest details of their history.

Though much has been done to lift the veil which for generations enshrouded those pioneers of the Massachusetts Colony who have remain to be dispelled, which part experience encourages us to believe is not beyond all possibility. The purpose of my essay tends in this direction. I shall endeavor to make some progress towards filling a lacuna in the record of secular and religious life in the interlude between the date of the arrival of Governor Winthrop and the summer of 1633, when, for the first time, we have records showing that a meeting-house had been erected in Salem.

The question as to whether or not the frame of a portrait structure which the Governor of the Bay Colony had erected to settle the question very aptly described as "a public dispute about building pos so very homely were" on premises remote from the centre of the city, in verification thereof of the meeting-house I have just mentioned- that is, of the first house erected for public worship in Salem- has recently been assailed by the adverse report of

that Committee. This question had become of considerable moment, since, although those who held the affirmative were comparatively few at the outset, the prominence given to the subject through the employment of those arts by which newspaper men exalt the fame of patent medicines was fast gaining and discriminating for the old relic an authentication so apparently conclusive ~~and so widespread~~, that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to counteract it if it was suffered to continue much longer. The circumstance most appalling to those who feared for the reputation of the Institute, by its apparent commitment to a perversion of history and an extravagant misappropriation of its funds devoted to better uses, was the recommendation by the President in his annual address in 1899 that the little building be enshrined in a spacious fire-proof edifice, to be erected for this purpose at great expense, and so transmitted to posterity as an object worthy of universal reverence.

Forty years ago the Massachusetts Historical Society had unadvisedly given encouragement to this scheme by admitting to its published proceedings the extravagant and entirely unfounded claims of the Salem

that Commitee. This question had become of considerable moment, since, although those who held the affirmative were comparatively few as the outset, the prominence given to the subject through the employment of those arts by which newspaper men exalt the merits of patent medicines was fast gaining for the old relic an authentication so apparently conclusive and [illegible]. Had it would be difficult, if not impossible, to counteract it if it was suffered to continue much longer. The circumstance most appealing to those who feared for the reputation of the Institute, by its supposed connectment to a perversion of history, was an extravagant misapprehension of its funds devoted to better uses, was the recommendation by the President in his annual address in 1900 that the little building be erected in a spacious fire-proof edifice, to be erected for this purpose at great expense, and so transmitted to posterity as an object worthy of universal reverence.

Forty years ago the Massachusetts Historical Society had [illegible] given encouragement to this scheme by admitting to its publication pre-[illegible] the extravagant and entirely unfounded claims of the [illegible]

promoters, as follows:-

"The frame of the first house of worship erected in Salem, on the site of the present edifice occupied by the First Church, had been indicated by tradition as still in existence and forming part of a building in another vicinity; that recent investigations by members of the Essex Institute, ~~among whom the late George A. Ward, Esq., was actively engaged,~~ had resulted in the identification of that portion of the building which had been used in the construction of the old church; and that careful measurements of different parts of the structure corresponded exactly with the dimensions of the first house of worship as recorded in contemporary documents.

By the exertions of certain members of the Institute, and other citizens of Salem, the frame had been secured, and, after being restored in those parts which were decayed, was to be erected on a lot in the rear of Plummer Hall, and protected by a substantial and permanent covering, the interior being so arranged as to exhibit the timbers of the ancient building, and at the same time to afford a place of deposit for certain antiquarian relics from the cabinet of the Institute."

It is due to the Massachusetts Historical Society, however, to add that three years later, Mr. Winthrop, its President, quietly ignored the whole affair in his remarks on the occasion of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the settlement of Boston, when he reviewed at considerable length the early history of the first settlement of Salem and the organization of the First Church there.

Fortunately, in their report, the Committee of the Insti-

promoters, as follows:-

"The frame of the first house of worship erected in Salem, on the site of the present edifice occupied by the First Church, has been indicated by tradition as still in existence and forming part of a building in another village; that recent investigations by members of the Essex Institute, during which the frame of a house of worship was erected, have resulted in the identification of that portion of the building which had been used as the combination of the old church and that careful measurements of different parts of the structure corresponded exactly with the dimensions of the first house of worship as described in contemporary documents.

By the exertions of certain members of the Institute, and other citizens of Salem, the frame was taken down, and being restored in three parts which were labeled, was, after erected on a lot in the rear of Plummer Hall, and to be substantial and permanent covering, the interior being so arranged as to exhibit the timbers of the building, and at the same time to afford a space of deposit for certain antiquarian relics from the cabinet of the Institute."

It is due to the Massachusetts Historical Society, however, to add that three years later, Mr. Winthrop, its President, quietly ignored the whole affair in his remarks on the occasion of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the settlement of Boston, when he reviewed at considerable length the early history of the first settlement of Salem and the organization of the first church there.

Fortunately, in their report, the Committee of the Trust

tute, after they had had the subject under consideration for more than three years, aided by a liberal allowance for defraying the expense of exhaustive research, not only explicitly rejected the theory of the genuineness of the so-called relic as a historical fact, but discredited the so-called tradition as uncorroborated and insufficient; as follows:-

> "The Committee are unanimous in the conclusion that the frame of the building now preserved in the rear of Plummer Hall is not the frame of the first Puritan meeting-house erected in Salem. No other conclusion is possible than that at no time previous to its promulgation by the Institute [in 1859 and 1860] was there any general currency, credence or knowledge of such a tradition throughout a community of people who would have willingly and fondly cherished and made the most of it."

The field being ~~now~~ thus cleared of the chief source of embarrassment, we may venture upon further inquiry, without fear of opposition or reproof.

I think we may safely start with the assumption that the first meeting-house in the Colony of Massachusetts was erected in Salem.

This is the concurrent testimony of all contemporary and

subsequent writers of New England history. Directly to the point is the entry made in the records of the First Church, in Salem, by the Rev. Samuel Fisk, Pastor, on the day of his ordination, October 8, 1718, in the meeting-house which "was begun to be raised on May 21, 1718, and it was completely raised May 24, 1718." The congregation worshipped in this meeting-house for the first time on the thirteenth day of July of that year. The record is as follows:-

> "This is the third house erected for the public worship of God, on the same spot of land on which the first church was built in this Town and which was the first in the Province."

This Samuel Fisk was grandson of John Fisk, who was pastor of the same church organized in [illegible] and building before it was begun in

The two colonies of Massachusetts and New Plymouth having been united in 1692, under the Province Charter, by the name of "The Province of the Massachusetts Bay in New England," Mr. Fisk evidently used the word "province" as equivalent to "Massachusetts", meaning to exclude Plymouth, which had a church and congregation and a place of worship antedating all the churches of Massachusetts, but not under the control of the Massachusetts Colony. However clear his intention, his expression was not sufficiently exact, since, when he made

the entry in his record, the Province embraced both colonies.

Assuming that he meant the Massachusetts Colony, it is easy to verify his record by comparing it with the date of the founding of the other early churches of this Colony. Since, however, by the year 1649 no less than thirty churches had been established in the colony, it is sufficient to give the dates in chronological order of the founding of the next eight churches following the organization of the first or Salem church.

These are:-

I. The church at Dorchester, which was instituted in England, but with its pastor and teacher emigrated in a body, and, after some wandering from place to place here, appears to have comfortably settled down in Dorchester sometime before June 28, 1630- the date commonly given being the 30th of the same month.

II. The founders of the church in Boston having first landed at Salem and though for a time suspiciously regarded by the Salemites on account of their not being ready to renounce the discipline of the church of England in sundry particulars, soon overcame this objection, and in June,

1630, joined with the Salem congregation in listening to the last sermon preached by the gifted and beloved Higginson soon to depart from the scenes of his earthly labors. According to Cotton Mather, the appropriate text of this sermon was Matthew XI, 7: "What went ye out into the wilderness to see?"

From Salem this company proceeded to Charlestown, and on the 30th of July, in the "Great House" as it was called, built the previous year by Thomas Graves, (an engineer who had been sent by the London Company in the fleet which brought Higginson) Winthrop, Dudley, Johnson and the Rev. John Wilson mutually entered into a church covenant, choosing Mr. Wilson pastor. But this was not to be their place of permanent settlement. On the 30th of September, they removed to Boston, Winthrop taking with him the frame of a dwelling-house he had erected at Charlestown and re-erecting it in Boston. The loss of these leading members temporarily broke up the church of Charlestown, which, however, was re-organized November 2, 1632, with Thomas James as pastor and Zechariah Symmes as teacher. The "Great House" appears to

have served for their meeting-house until 1636, when a new church was erected nearer Charlestown Neck.

III. Boston. The first church in Boston, as we have seen, dates from the Covenant of its leading members at Charlestown, July 30, 1630, but the date of its removal to Boston was September 30 that year, and apparently at that date or earlier their first meeting-house was erected on the site long occupied by Brazier's Building, in State Street. The Rev. Benjamin Wadsworth stated in 1711 that, according to the best information he could gather, the congregation occupied this meeting-house about nine or ten years. Since it was sold by the Ruling Elders and the deacon of the church, as agents of the town and church of Boston, to Robert Thompson in 1639, and the proceeds applied towards defraying the cost of the second structure, which was first opened for religious services August 23, 1640, there is a seeming discrepancy of about two years between this account and that of Joshua Scottow, who came to Boston in 1634 and published in 1697 a Narrative of the Planting of the Massachusetts Colony, in which, contrasting the earlier church with its successor,

he speaks of the condition of the church "after seven years' growth," from which it might be inferred that he reckoned the existence of the church as beginning in 1632. But it is very clear that he had in mind the body of communicants, and not the meeting-house; still, since he refers to an experience prior to the occupation of the new meeting-house, his testimony supports the theory that the structure had been occupied at least seven years before it was abandoned.

When we consider that the third meeting-house in Salem, 1718, was begun and completed in one week less than two months by the carpenters of Salem, and also the expedition with which Graves and his men laid out the town of Charlestown, erected a fort and built the "Great House" there,(which was so substantial that it remained in use until it perished in the flames at the burning of the town by the British troops in 1775,)we shall have little cause to doubt the practicability of erecting, during the time the leaders of the Boston church were in Charlestown deliberating upon the future, a meeting-house of sufficient capacity for all the pioneer inhabitants of Boston.

IV. Watertown appears to have gathered and settled its church about the same time that the Boston church was organized in Charlestown. The permanent organization of the latter, however, occurred in 1632, when James and Symmes were settled as ministers.

The churches of

V. Roxbury,

VI. Lynn and

VII. Charlestown were founded in 1632,

and the church in

VIII. Cambridge October 11, 1633.

Meanwhile the tide of immigration was pouring in, and plans for church fellowship were forming in numerous other places. Towns were springing up, each one of which was required by law to erect a meeting-house and settle an able, learned and orthodox minister. Amid all this activity throughout the Colony, it must not be assumed, simply because the ~~local~~ public records are defective, that ecclesiastical affairs were at a standstill in Salem, or that nothing was being done in other places except where shown by extant public records.

It is curious to note how commonly we are disposed to take a pessimistic view of the unknown things of the past. At Boston, Lynn, Salem - indeed, everywhere,- the first forgotten house of worship is pictured as a barn, a thatched building of no known dimensions save that it was one story high, anything but a symmetrical edifice of an architectural contour and dimensions, if not especially beautiful, at least not repulsive. Now I cannot find any sufficient reason adduced for this belittling of the earliest designers and builders of our meeting-houses. Drake, for instance, after declaring that he has been unable to find any dimensions given of the first meeting-house in Boston, or any further description of it than that it had a thatched roof and mud walls, straightway proceeds to give a picture of it in two places in his "History and Antiquities of Boston," which has been repeatedly copied in historical works as a true likeness of the building, showing a barn-like structure, roofed with thatch. In like manner Dr. Bentley declares, without referring to any authority:-

> "An unfinished building, of one story, was used occasionally for public worship in Salem from 1629 to 1634."

Now I take the liberty to challenge these statements, on the strength

of the testimony, first, of Thomas Lechford, a lawyer, of Clement's Inn, London, and resident of Boston from June, 1638, to August, 1641, who traveled extensively in New England, and enjoyed the respect and confidence of many of our best people, though not sharing their views ~~of~~ on civil and ecclesiastical polity. In a book printed for him in London in 1642, entitled "Plain Dealing or Newes from New England", he declares of New England, "the publique worship is in as fair a meeting-house as they can provide, wherein, in most places, they have been at great charges." This is decidedly against Drake's Mud-wall theory.

My next witness in the same line shall be Edward Johnson, highly esteemed and respected as a citizen of probity and good judgment, a devoted public servant, and author of the "Wonder Working Providence of Sion's Saviour in New England," published in 1654, but written apparently eight years earlier. In this book under date of 1634 he describes the town of Ipswich, which was Winthrop's Plantation of Agawam, incorporated that year, under this new name. Among other attractive features, he mentions the meeting-house there as being "beautifully built" and he adds "many of their houses very fair built,

with pleasant gardens and orchards." It is noticeable that John Dunton, the English traveler and book publisher, in making a round of visits among his customers here in 1686, applies almost exactly the same eulogistic language to the Ipswich meeting-house and its surroundings at that day. I must confess, however, that, since a new meeting-house was erected in Ipswich about 1678, this coincidence suggests the probability of plagiarism on the part of the garrulous bookseller, a suspicion which his well-known habit of flattery does not tend to allay.

Unimpeachable contemporary authority, precluding the necessity of further argument against this disparagement of our earliest meeting-houses, is to be found in the description of the first Boston meeting-house in Scottow's Narrative already mentioned; yet, strange to say, I believe that the impression which still stubbornly prevails among those who are regarded as authorities in architecture is traceable to a misunderstanding of Scottow's language.

The "mud walls" and small windows of the earlier building, and the "wooden chalice" used at the communion table there, which Scottow contrasts with the large chambers and windows and the walls "ceiled

with cedar," of its successor, hardly justify the inference that the first building was the one-story, thatched cabin which Drake and others after him have depicted. On the contrary, his words imply no more than that, for want of lime for plastering, the ordinary expedient was resorted to, of coating the walls with clay sustained by lathing. The supposition that the walls were made of solid clay or adobe can hardly be entertained in face of the record, which shows that the building as late as July, 1660, remained in the quiet and peaceable possession of the person who purchased it in 1639, or his representatives. Such an experience would be unparalleled in our climate.

From the mass of chaff which this book contains, we are able to extract some very interesting and instructive passages, not to be found so distinctly stated elsewhere. Of the coloniza-

tion of New England he says,-

"Men of narrow spirits, of mean capacities, and fortunes, had not been capable to officiate in so great a worke, that such, and so many Gentlemen of Ancient and Worshipful Families, of Name and Number, of Character and Quality, should Combine and Unite in so desperate and dangerous a Design, attended with such insuperable Difficulties, and Hazards, in the plucking up of their Native Soil, parting with their Patrimonies, Inheritances, plentiful Estates, and settlement of Houses well Furnished; of Land well Stock'd, and with comfortable ways of Subsistence, which the first Planters Deserted; and not a few did leave all their worldly hopes, to come into this Desert, & unknown Land, and smoaky Cottages, to the Society of Cursed Cannibals, (as they have proved to be) and at best wild Indians; what less than a Divine Ardour could inflame a People thus circumstanced to a work so contrary to Flesh and Blood."

His references to the settlement of Salem seem to confirm the opinion that not only was the church organized in 1629 and the officers ordained immediately upon the arrival of Higginson's company, but that formal possession of the territory was then taken according to the form of feoffment recognized as legal by the English Courts, so as to bar the aborigines. The attendance at the ordination seems to have been large, one at least of the congregation,- Edward Gibbons, who afterward became a leading citizen of Boston and Major-General of the Colony,- coming from as far as Mt. Wollaston or Quincy, more than twenty miles distant. Gibbons was so struck by the orderly and solemn proceedings that during the services he fell upon his knees and dramatically announced his conversion, much to the astonishment of such of the beholders as had known him as particularly worldly-minded. If we ponder on these incidents, we shall better understand how so much excitement could have been caused in that early day, with no other record than Scottow's Narrative many years afterward. Although not stated with absolute clearness, the inference seems well founded that all these proceedings took place in the meeting-house, the materials

for completing which were brought from England by the immigrants. He says:-

> "These Prudent Under takers sent forth their Forlorn Hope in two ships, Laden with Passengers, and Servants; two years before they mov'd with their main Body, and Pattent Government, which were fully Furnished with a Pastor and Teacher, worthy Higginson and Skelton, and all Materials, for Completing of a Church of Christ, according to Divine Institution; Who safely Arriving according to their predeterminate Design of Inlargement of Christ's Kingdom, and His Majesty of England's Dominion; Firstly, they set up their Standards, Dethroning Satan, they cast him out of Heaven: which beyond times memorial, he had in the Natives Consciences, and by Turf and Twig they took possession of this his large Continent, and set up the first Church in these parts, in a place they then called Salem;"

The haste and uncertainty attending the initial plans for removal to and settlement in Boston, taking advantage of which several other towns had become established in advance of this intended metropolis, thus leading Scott to exclaim in another place, "O, poor New England, especially Boston, in the day of it, poor to a proverb, of being the last town in our first Founding," was sufficient provocation for lamentation. But by the time he wrote his Narrative, this discouraging state of affairs had ceased to exist. This appears from the conclusion of his lamentation, which is in a more cheerful tone, expressive of the greatest satisfaction

at the assured glory of the once desponding, now but triumphant metropolis In ascribing the cause of this great progress, he says,-

"Those of other Towns enquired, how the Mean Ones lived here, the Rich had their Farms Abroad to Subsist by, but as for the poor, how could they subsist? The Answer was their Ministry was so sweet unto them, and the Bread of Life so savoury to their Souls, that they forgot their Bodily Food, so welcome was Christian Society to them, that he who had but an Acre of Land for his House Lot, parted with one half of it to a desirable Neighbor; he that had but half an acre did the like: Thus were we increast, so as instead of a desolate place, where our Fathers found no Town to dwell in, they Cried unto the Lord hungry and thirsty, who led them forth by a right way, that we are become a small City of Habitation. God gave some of them then a particular Faith upon Psalm 107, 4 to 8. When as they were brought to small store of provision, upon the first Market Day by the General Court appointed to be kept, they put to Sail half of it, to handsel it with. Thus was this contemptible place raised up, so that in less than sixty years, it's reputed the Mart of North America."

The accepted judgment of professional experts on the aspect of the early meeting-houses of Boston,- which, I think you will agree with me before I finish this paper, is not sustained by the results of profound investigation and comparison,- is well summarized in the following extract from an article in the Memorial History of Boston;- Says the writer,-

> "In the first churches of the Puritan settlers in Boston, it is impossible to feel any other interest than that of an antiquarian or a descendant..... Less attractive buildings, perhaps, never cumbered the ground. ..... It is not a matter of poignant regret that no representatives exist of the two wooden meeting-houses which stood, the one in King Street, and the other hard by, in Marlboro' Street, and the latter of which, burned in 1711, was replaced by a brick building, of which a view is given in Vol II., p. 219 of this work."

We should not expect to find purely classic architecture prevailing here in the early colonial period. Indeed, the renaissance of classic styles did not appear in England until long after Inigo Jonesand Sir Christopher Wren and their pupils or disciples had introduced, sometimes with original ingenious modifications of such harmony and fitness as not to offend the most fastidious taste, the designs of Palladio, the Italian founder of a new school of arch-

itecture. The adoption of the new ideas proceeded slowly in England, and I do not recall an example either in Old or New England of what is known as the "Wren" style of steeple until after the great fire in London. I am not sure that I have ever seen the picture of such a structure, either in England or America, ante-dating the reign of Queen Anne. I am very positive that no such example can be pointed out in the United States.

The order given to Wren, in rebuilding the burnt district in London, to erect fifty new churches, gave him ample scope for the exercise of his fecundity of invention and his wonderful skill in adapting attractive designs to novel exigencies.

Our style of architecture was simple and attractive. It was peculiarly English, dating from the time of the Reformation. An attempt to revive either the Gothic or the Classic style would have been preposterous in this new country, even if we possessed the materials and the means for such extravagance. The Puritan was more modest in his tastes, not because he was insensible of the majesty and sublimity of the ancient cathedrals. No rigid Churchman ever ex-

pressed more finely and sympathetically the emotions which their lofty buttresses and columns, their groined arches, long-drawn aisles and fretted vaults, their "storied windows richly dight," and their mural inscriptions, inspire in the cultivated mind, than did the great Puritan poet. Those grand Gothic piles, however, did not supplant the deep-rooted affection which the Puritan bore to the rustic church where the communion table had superseded the altar, where his children were brought to be christened, and in whose walls and pavements were embedded the carvings of the family escutcheons and tender inscriptions to the memory of his departed kindred.

If not coeval with the Reformation, these churches grew up soon afterward all over the kingdom, either as if sprouting from the ruins of some neglected abbey, or standing aloof, surrounded by the sons and daughters reared within their walls, now slumbering beneath the turf in their last repose .

I intended to say something more about the general type of these

churches, which seems to have been patterned after old St. Paul's Church in London, as it appeared before the great fire of 1666, and to illustrate my discourse by pictures of English scenery, but this would try ~~strain~~ your patience and is unnecessary in view of the sufficiency of a few striking examples directly in point. Let me invite you, therefore, to a glimpse of the Cathedral of old St. Paul's, London, so renowned in English history, and devoted, like our New England meeting-houses, to secular as well as religious uses. The long arcade or aisle, running from end to end of the first floor, was the public reception hall for the entertainment of strangers, and the daily haunt of merchants and news venders, politicians, authors, clergymen and public functionaries- in short, the principal exchange of the metropolis, where children were permitted to enjoy quiet amusement and pedlars vended small wares. Just outside was "Paul's Cross," where habitually the most famous prelates of the established hierarchy and eloquently persuasive Puritan prophets were attentively listened to by enthusiastic audiences, including occasionally royalty itself.

Inigo Jones, with the true instinct of an up-to-date architect, endeavored to enhance the beauty of the Cathedral by erecting a new porch of the renaissance style according to Palladio. Although much admired by the professional dilettante of the day, it was, as you can see, grotesquely incongruous with the Gothic main body of the building. This porch was consumed with the rest of the Cathedral in the great fire of 1666, but I call your attention to a correct representation of the façade of this porch, to assist you to imagine how such an appendage would improve the looks of the Old South or be used to advantage at some convenient point on the walls of Trinity Church or the Roman Catholic Cathedral in this city.

Just fifty years after Higginson's installation in Salem, Bishop Gilbert Burnet published his famous History of the Reformation of the Church of England. It is interesting to remember in this connection that the Bishop was the father of William Burnet sometime Governor of Massachusetts, in the line of Endicott and Winthrop, and more intimately connected with our history by the circumstance that he gave the hand of his daughter, Mary, to

William Brown of Salem, whose son William built that fine specimen of regular architecture, the memory of which is perpetuated in "Brown's Folly," the name of the hill on which it stood. Bishop Burnet's History was printed in London, in an elegant folio edition with an engraved title page bearing the author's likeness surrounded by a frame and panels, giving pictures of the old ecclesiastical buildings before the Reformation, and opposite these the representation of a Protestant church style. I call your attention now to an enlargement of the vignette which shows this new style church. Being evidently built of stone, the old-style buttresses, which are of no use in a wooden structure, were retained. Now this building very fairly typifies the New England meeting-house which Thomas Pemberton calls "of the first architecture in New England."

I have mentioned Pemberton as if he were as familiar to you as any member of the Old Planters' Society. Since you will not find his autobiography in "Who's Who," he may need a brief introduction to some of you. Let me then say that he was one of

the most laborious, active and intelligent accumulators of data for our local history that we ever had, yet modest in proportion to his great acquirements. I will not attempt to enumerate all the works that proceeded from his pen, nor enlarge upon our obligations to him for recovering and recording valuable data that, but for him, might have been irrevocably lost. For our present purpose it is sufficient to say that his life extended through the period beginning in 1728 and ending in 1807, here in Boston. It is said,- though I have never put the librarian to the trouble of showing them to me,- that he bequeathed all his MSS. to the Massachusetts Historical Society, and this I do not doubt, from what those who have been privileged to use his unpublished papers have publicly acknowledged. Some of his productions have been printed by the Society, and they are by no means the least useful contributions to the Society's publications. Among these is his "Description of Boston," from which the phrase I have quoted is taken. It occurs in his account of the Old North Church, in which he clears the traditions relating to that building from some contradictions

and obscurities.

From an old book which Pemberton rescued from oblivion, he ascertained to his satisfaction (and there is no one whose accuracy I would more implicitly confide in) that in 1648 the meeting-house of the Second Congregational Society in Boston was finished, but the Society "had not as yet called anyone to office." This was the first Old North. In 1676 it was destroyed by fire, and rebuilt the following year. From the vane, which was uninjured in that fire, the date of the rebuilding was ascertained. There is not another known record than this of Pemberton's of the date of the building or the date of the rebuilding in 1677.

During the Revolution this building was destroyed by the British soldiers then in possession of Boston, who found it convenient for fuel. After the Revolution, the site of this meeting-house was abandoned. This, however, is of no consequence for our present purpose, which concerns solely the aspect of the house of 1648, rebuilt in 1677- both apparently constructed upon the same general plan. Now, if we can assure ourselves of the aspect of either of these structures, we shall be able to show by it what

Pemberton calls a model "of the first architecture in New England."

It has seemed sometimes, I presume, to all of us who have been discouraged in long and fruitless search for a missing link needed for the absolute mastery of a theme or to complete a perfect chain of incidents, the necessary relation of which is surmised but the proof wanting, that there is no such thing as an unsurmountable difficulty, but that somehow or somewhere the object of our solicitude awaits our recognition. This is a subject which admits of endless discussion and surprising and even marvellous illustrations. The discovery of two pictures of the Old North Church is one instance in point. Hundreds and thousands of the citizens of Boston were perfectly familiar with the shape of the building, its roof and steeple; yet no one of these seems to have deemed it sufficiently important to make a complete sketch of it, however rude. Even Pemberton seems never to have attempted a drawing of any of the historic buildings which he describes. The steeple or belfry appears in enormous disproportions in several of

the views of Boston,- notably in the amusing pictures by Paul Revere,- but none of these views clearly show how that tower was attached to the building. This has led to some interesting conjectures as to the relation which the porch, tower or steeple bore to the main building. Of these I shall say more presently, after I have shown how a very satisfactory clew has been obtained to the salient features of both the Old North and the Old South churches by a critical examination of William Burgess's map, which was published in 1728 and declared by Dr. Shurtleff to be evidently a corrected and improved copy of the map by Capt. Bonner, published in 1722. Burgess's map I show you on the screen, and call your attention to the representation thereon of the Old North Church, also of the Old South. Of both of these I have made enlarged copies, by which you will observe the style of the roofs, and notice that in each case the tower or belfry is in the centre of the roof, at the place where in a cathedral the nave and transepts come together. Of the old views of Boston, that by Carwitham gives an idea of the belfry more nearly corresponding to Burgess's. The

the views of Boston,- notably in the amusing pictures by Paul Revere,- but none of these views clearly show how that tower was attached to the building. This has led to some interesting conjectures as to the relation which the porch, tower or steeple bore to the main building. Of these I shall say more presently, after I have shown how a very satisfactory clue has been obtained to the salient features of both the Old North and the Old South churches by a critical examination of William Burgess's map, which was published in 1728 and declared by Dr. Shurtleff to be evidently a corrected and improved copy of the map by Capt. Bonner, published in 1722. Burgess's map I show you on the screen, and call your attention to the representation thereon of the Old North Church, also of the Old South. Of both of these I have made enlarged copies, by which you will observe the style of the roofs, and notice that in each case the tower or belfry is in the centre of the roof, at the place where in a cathedral the nave and transepts come together. Of the old views of Boston, that by Burnham gives an idea of the belfry more nearly corresponding to Burgess's. The

latter, however, is a view from above, whereas the former is from a horizontal standpoint.